

REMARKS

Claim 19 was previously objected to because of an informality. Claims 1-5 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watanabe et al.* (USPN 5,966,589) in view of *Endo et al.* (USPN 6,016,174). Applicants respectfully believe that this issues were traversed by the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed January 21, 2005 (which was indicated by the Advisory Action as being entered).

Claims 6-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watanabe et al.* (USPN 5,966,589) in view of *Endo et al.* (USPN 6,016,174) and further in view of Applicants' allegedly admitted prior art. Claims 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watanabe et al.* (USPN 5,966,589) in view of Applicants' allegedly admitted prior art. Applicants have amended independent claims 6, 19, and 20 to further define the invention. In view of the newly recited features, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of independent claims 6, 19, and 20 are moot. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 6, 19, and 20, as amended, as well as dependent claims 7-9 are allowable.

In addition, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the arguments presented in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed January 21, 2005. Applicants respectfully acknowledge that the full consideration of a response after a final rejection is not routine. Applicants recognize that saving labor and cost are usually desirable results, but Applicants respectfully assert that the prior art does not teach or suggest that modifying the device of

Watanabe et al. to include the grinding area would save labor and cost. That is, the prior art does not teach or suggest a “link” between the addition of a grinding area and saving labor/cost.

Applicants believe that the claimed combination to achieve the improved structure is the Applicants’ recognition and not found in the prior art.

With respect to the comments of the Advisory Action that the references cited directed to grinding areas used in LCD process are prior art with the exception of the Hansen reference.” This reference was present as documentary evidence as requested by the Amendment filed July 14, 2004. However, contrary to the assertion of the Advisory Action, Applicants respectfully assert that the “internet articles” also cited as “documentary evidence” have publication dates of 2004. Therefore, the “internet articles” are also not prior art and, as a result, all of the documentary evidence provided is not prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.


If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Date: February 24, 2005

By:


Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20004-2541

202-739-3000 (Phone)

202-739-3001 (Fax)